arXiv:cond-mat/0312698v2 [cond-mat.stat-mech] 13 Jan 2005

Direct Perturbation Theory on the Electron Spin Resonance Shift and Its Applications

Yoshitaka Maeda and Masaki Oshikawa
Department of Physics, Tokyo Institute of Technology, Oh-oka-yama, Meguro-ku, Tokyo 152-8551, Japan

We formulate a direct and systematic perturbation theory on the shift of the main paramagnetic peak in electron spin resonance, and derive a general expression up to the second order. It is applied to the one-dimensional XXZ and transverse Ising models in the high field limit, to obtain explicit results including the polarization dependence at arbitrary temperature.

Introduction — Electron spin resonance (ESR) is not only an important experimental method, but also poses fundamental problems in theoretical physics. At the same time, it provides a good testing ground for theories, as very precise spectra can be obtained in many experiments. This is evident historically in the fact that the general formulation of linear response theory, the so-called Kubo formula, appeared first in a treatment of magnetic resonance by Kubo and Tomita, [1] and this became a standard theory on ESR. In addition to steady advances in experimental techniques, a recent development of a field theory formulation [2, 3] for one-dimensional systems and also of numerical approaches [4, 5, 6] renewed interest in ESR.

In ESR, we study a magnetic system under an applied field H. The direction of the applied field is defined as z axis. The Hamiltonian is given by

$$\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_Z + \mathcal{H}_{SU(2)} + \mathcal{H}', \tag{1}$$

where $\mathcal{H}_{SU(2)}$ represents the isotropic interactions such as the Heisenberg exchange, and $\mathcal{H}'$ is the anisotropy which is often small. $\mathcal{H}_Z = -HS^z$ is the Zeeman term, and the notation S^α is used for the total spin operator as $S^\alpha \equiv \sum_j S^\alpha_j$ throughout this Letter.

An electromagnetic radiation, with the frequency ω of the same order as H, is applied and its absorption is measured. We consider the Faraday configuration, in which the oscillating magnetic field is perpendicular to the z axis. Generally, within the linear response theory, the absorption intensity is related to the imaginary part $\chi''_{aa}(\omega)$ of the complex dynamical spin susceptibility (*i.e.* the retarded Green's function of the spin operators) $\chi_{aa}(\omega)$ at zero momentum, where a is a spin axis determined by the polarization of the electromagnetic wave. If the oscillating magnetic field is parallel to the x (y) direction, the absorption intensity is related to χ''_{xx} (χ''_{yy}). In the presence of general anisotropy, S^x and S^y are not equivalent, since they give different spectra. We call this dependence polarization dependence [2, 3, 7].

In this Letter, for simplicity, we discuss $\chi''_{aa}(\omega)$ as a function of ω at a fixed H, although usually in experiments the absorption intensity $\propto \omega\chi''_{aa}(\omega)$ is measured with varying H while ω is constant. When the spins are non-interacting, $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_Z$, we trivially obtain

$$\chi''_{aa}(\omega) \propto \delta(\omega - H). \tag{2}$$

We thus find the delta-function peak, which is called the paramagnetic resonance, at $\omega = H$. A characteristic of ESR, which measures the zero wave vector component of χ'', is that the lineshape still keeps the same form even in the presence of $\mathcal{H}_{SU(2)}$. Nontrivial changes in the lineshape only occurs in the presence of anisotropy. For a small anisotropy $\mathcal{H}'$, the paramagnetic resonance at $\omega = H$ is often shifted and broadened. It is thus useful to obtain the shift and width of the main paramagnetic resonance peak in terms of the perturbation theory in the anisotropy $\mathcal{H}'$, with the unperturbed Hamiltonian $\mathcal{H}_0 = \mathcal{H}_Z + \mathcal{H}_{SU(2)}$.

However, this is not as easy as it may sound, even in a weakly interacting system. A realistic, broadened lineshape cannot be obtained in any finite order of the perturbative expansion of χ''. This is apparent as χ'' has the delta function at the zeroth order, while the "true" χ'' with a broadened resonance generally does not contain a delta function. The delta function could only be eliminated by a summation of the perturbation expansion of χ'' up to the infinite order.

Several existing approaches to the shift and width are based on an infinite summation of the perturbation series, relying on various grounds. In the Kubo-Tomita theory [1], the infinite summation is carried out by assuming that higher order terms in the cumulant expansion vanish. Although this assumption appears to be correct in certain cases, its range of validity has not been clarified. Indeed, it was pointed out recently that a straightforward application of the Kubo-Tomita theory fails in the presence of the Dzyaloshinskii-Moriya interaction [2, 3, 8]. For $S = 1/2$ chain at low temperature, a field theory approach based on bosonization technique is developed [2, 3]. There, the infinite summation is performed systematically in terms of the Feynman-Dyson self-energy. However, this is only possible because of the particular mapping of the ESR problem to the Green's function of the boson field, which holds only for one-dimensional system at low temperatures. Therefore, no immediate generalization of this technique to other cases of interest is possible.

In the Mori-Kawasaki theory [9], an ansatz is made for the dynamical spin susceptibility as

$$\chi_{aa}(\omega) \propto \frac{-1}{\omega - H - M(\omega)}, \tag{3}$$

in terms of the memory function $M(\omega)$, which is assumed to be smooth at $\omega \sim H$. It is actually of the same form that results from the self-energy summation. With this ansatz, it is possible to determine the shift and width from the low order perturbative expansion of the susceptibility. However, it should be noted that in the absence of the diagrammatic perturbation theory, there is generally no justification of the memory function ansatz (3). Thus, its range of validity has not been clarified.

The shift and width, on the other hand, have also been discussed in terms of the moments. The ESR shift may be related to the normalized first moment that is the "mean frequency" of the entire ESR absorption. However, it often happens that, in the presence of the anisotropy, the peaks of the absorption spectrum appear at higher frequencies such as around $2H, 3H, 4H \ldots$. In the presence of such satellite peaks, in order to discuss the shift of the main paramagnetic resonance to higher orders, one must calculate the projected moments which are defined by restricting the domain of integration to the support of the main paramagnetic resonance. However, the existing calculations [10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16] of the projected moments involve nontrivial assumptions, and their range of validity is again questionable. The polarization dependence has not been discussed in terms of these approaches based on the projected moments.

Given this situation, 50 years after the publication of the Kubo-Tomita theory, it would be worthwhile to develop an alternative approach to ESR which is complementary to the existing ones.

Formulation — In this Letter, we aim to develop a perturbation theory directly on the shift of the main paramagnetic resonance.

For simplicity, we only consider a linear polarization of the oscillating magnetic field. When the oscillating magnetic field is parallel to the a axis, the ESR peak position $\omega_{m,a}$ may be defined by a maximum of χ''_{aa}, which satisfies

$$\partial_\omega \chi''_{aa}(\omega_{m,a}, \alpha) = 0, \tag{4}$$

where α is the small perturbation parameter which gives the magnitude of the anisotropy $\mathcal{H}'$. For the sake of brevity, we will omit the polarization index a from $\omega_{m,a}$ until we discuss the polarization dependence.

Our strategy is to expand the peak frequency in α as

$$\omega_m = \omega_m^{(0)} + \alpha\omega_m^{(1)} + \alpha^2\omega_m^{(2)} + \ldots. \tag{5}$$

However, an attempt to solve condition (4) perturbatively encounters a problem already at the zeroth order. This is because, at the zeroth order, the dynamical susceptibility is given by the singular delta function as in (2). In fact, at the zeroth order, (4) holds for any $\omega_m \neq H$.

The delta function can be defined as

$$\delta(\omega - H) = -\frac{1}{\pi} \lim_{\epsilon \to +0} \mathrm{Im} \frac{1}{\omega - H + i\epsilon}, \tag{6}$$

where ϵ is often called the convergence factor, which is usually regarded as positive infinitesimal. The introduction of the convergence factor corresponds to multiplying $e^{-\epsilon t}$ with the retarded Green's functions, as functions of real time t. Generally, the inclusion of the convergence factor amounts to replacing ω with $\omega + i\epsilon$.

In order to circumvent the above problem due to the singularity, we perform the perturbative expansion (5), keeping the convergence factor ϵ finite. The limit $\epsilon \to +0$ is taken after the expansion is obtained. In fact, a finite ϵ is often used to estimate the continuous spectral functions from a finite-size numerical calculation, which inevitably yields a collection of delta functions. Sometimes, ϵ may be considered as a small but finite parameter that represents the relaxation effects which do not appear in the microscopic model but actually exist in a real system.

If the shift is Taylor expandable in both ϵ and α, this approach would give the correct perturbation series in α after taking the $\epsilon \to 0$ limit. This should be the case when the Mori-Kawasaki memory function ansatz is valid, as the shift is given by the real part of the memory function, which is assumed to be smooth at $\omega \sim H$ and to be Taylor expandable in α. As we will see below, our formulation is actually more general than the Mori-Kawasaki ansatz. Namely, our approach gives correct answer even when the line shape is Gaussian. In contrast, the ansatz (3) does not match the Gaussian line shape.

On the other hand, when the main paramagnetic resonance splits into multiple peaks, there would be multiple solutions to eq. (4) at $\omega \sim H$. Thus the present argument (as well as the Mori-Kawasaki memory function ansatz) does not apply to such cases in a straightforward manner. The generalization to this class of problems is discussed elsewhere [17]. In this Letter, we focus on the simplest case with the single main paramagnetic resonance peak.

Equation (4) is then expanded as

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \partial_\omega \chi''_{aa}(\omega_m, \alpha) \\ &= \partial_\omega \chi''_{aa}(\omega_m^{(0)}, 0) \\ &\quad + \alpha\{\partial_\omega^2 \chi''_{aa}(\omega_m^{(0)}, 0)\omega_m^{(1)} + \partial_\alpha \partial_\omega \chi''_{aa}(\omega_m^{(0)}, 0)\} \\ &\quad + \alpha^2\{\partial_\omega^2 \chi''_{aa}(\omega_m^{(0)}, 0)\omega_m^{(2)} + \frac{1}{2}\partial_\omega^3 \chi''_{aa}(\omega_m^{(0)}, 0)(\omega_m^{(1)})^2 \\ &\quad + \partial_\alpha \partial_\omega^2 \chi''_{aa}(\omega_m^{(0)}, 0)\omega_m^{(1)} + \frac{1}{2}\partial_\alpha^2 \partial_\omega \chi''_{aa}(\omega_m^0, 0)\} + \cdot \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

Solving eq. (7) order by order with respect to α, we obtain

$$\omega_m^{(1)} = -\frac{\partial_\alpha \partial_\omega \chi''_{aa}(\omega_m^{(0)}, 0)}{\partial_\omega^2 \chi''_{aa}(\omega_m^{(0)}, 0)} \tag{8}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \omega_m^{(2)} = &-\frac{1}{2\partial_\omega^2 \chi''_{aa}(\omega_m^{(0)}, 0)} \big(\partial_\omega^3 \chi''_{aa}(\omega_m^{(0)}, 0)(\omega_m^{(1)})^2 \\ &+ 2\partial_\alpha \partial_\omega^2 \chi''_{aa}(\omega_m^{(0)}, 0)\omega_m^{(1)} + \partial_\alpha^2 \partial_\omega \chi''_{aa}(\omega_m^0, 0)\big). \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

To evaluate these expressions, it is useful to derive the *exact* identities such as

$$\chi_{+-}(\omega) = -\frac{2\langle S^z\rangle}{N(\omega - H + i\epsilon)} + \frac{\langle[\mathcal{A}, S^-]\rangle/N + \chi_{\mathcal{A}\mathcal{A}^\dagger}(\omega)}{(\omega - H + i\epsilon)^2}, \tag{10}$$

where N is the total number of spins in the system, ϵ is the convergence factor mentioned above, χ_{+-} is the complex dynamical susceptibility of S^+ and S^-, and $\chi_{\mathcal{A}\mathcal{A}^\dagger}$ is that of $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{A}^\dagger$ where $\mathcal{A} \equiv [\mathcal{H}', S^+]$. The identity (10) follows from the Heisenberg equation of motion

$$\frac{dS^+}{dt} = -iHS^+ + i\mathcal{A}, \tag{11}$$

and its Hermitian conjugate (see also Appendix of ref. [2]). As discussed above, we regard the convergence factor ϵ as being finite until the expansion (5) of the shift is obtained.

After straightforward but tedious calculations, we obtain the shift of the main paramagnetic resonance up to the second order. The first order result reads

$$\alpha\omega_m^{(1)} = -\frac{\langle[\mathcal{A}, S^-]\rangle_0}{2\langle S^z\rangle_0}, \tag{12}$$

where we have introduced the notation $\langle\rangle_n$ as the n-th order contribution (in α) to the expectation value defined with respect to the full Hamiltonian (1). This result is independent of the polarization. Although it is found to be identical to the well-known formula by Kanamori and Tachiki and others [13, 18], our derivation is more systematic than the previous ones.

The second order result, on the other hand, is more involved and interesting as shown below. Unlike in the first order term (12), the shift in second order generally has a polarization dependence. Thus here we restore the polarization index a in the shift $\delta\omega_{m,a}$, which is given as

$$\begin{aligned}
&\alpha\omega_{m,a}^{(1)} + \alpha^2\omega_{m,a}^{(2)} = \\
&\quad -\frac{\langle[\mathcal{A}, S^-]\rangle_0 + \langle[\mathcal{A}, S^-]\rangle_1}{2\langle S^z\rangle_0} \\
&\quad + \frac{\langle[\mathcal{A}, S^-]\rangle_0}{2\langle S^z\rangle_0}\left[\frac{\langle S^z\rangle_1}{\langle S^z\rangle_0} \pm \frac{\langle[\mathcal{A}^\dagger, S^-]\rangle_0 - \langle[\mathcal{A}, S^+]\rangle_0}{4H\langle S^z\rangle_0}\right] \\
&\quad - \frac{N}{8\langle S^z\rangle_0}\lim_{\epsilon\to 0}\Bigg[4\chi'_{\mathcal{A}\mathcal{A}^\dagger} + 2\epsilon\partial_\omega\chi''_{\mathcal{A}\mathcal{A}^\dagger} \\
&\quad \pm \frac{1}{H}\left(\epsilon\left(\chi''_{\mathcal{A}\mathcal{A}} + \chi''_{\mathcal{A}^\dagger\mathcal{A}^\dagger}\right) - \epsilon^2\left(\partial_\omega\chi'_{\mathcal{A}\mathcal{A}} + \partial_\omega\chi'_{\mathcal{A}^\dagger\mathcal{A}^\dagger}\right)\right) \\
&\quad + \text{“}O(\epsilon^3)\text{”}\Bigg],
\end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

where χ' is the real part of the complex dynamical susceptibility, χ' and χ'' are evaluated at $\omega = \omega_m^{(0)}$, and the double sign $\pm$ takes $+$ or $-$ for $a = x$ and y, respectively; a is the polarization direction of the oscillating magnetic field. The term “$O(\epsilon^3)$” refers to the contributions with prefactors explicitly containing ϵ^3 or higher powers of ϵ.

Because of the limit $\epsilon \to +0$, the terms explicitly multiplied by powers of ϵ, including the “$O(\epsilon^3)$” terms, appear to vanish. However, the correlation functions in eq. (13) can have singularities as powers of $1/\epsilon$, leaving a finite contribution together with the explicit powers of ϵ. Thus we cannot ignore such terms a priori, and we show later a concrete example with such a nontrivial contribution. For brevity, in eq. (13) we have omitted writing out the “$O(\epsilon^3)$” terms explicitly, since they actually vanish in all the examples we have studied so far.

Eq. (13) should be valid up to the second order in the perturbation parameter α, in any dimension, at any temperature, for any spin, and for any interaction strength. However, it must be noted that the evaluation of the correlation functions appearing in eq. (13) is still a nontrivial problem.

Applications — As a demonstration, here we apply our general second-order result (13) to the high field limit $\mathcal{H}_Z \gg \mathcal{H}_{SU(2)}, \mathcal{H}'$. In this case, the isotropic interaction $\mathcal{H}_{SU(2)}$ (if any) may be included in the perturbation $\mathcal{H}'$. This is convenient for calculation, because the unperturbed Hamiltonian $\mathcal{H}_0 = \mathcal{H}_Z$ is trivially solvable. As a consequence, eq. (13) can be evaluated exactly. Although this is a weak-coupling limit, the problem of the ESR lineshape is by no means trivial, as is evident in the results to be shown. Here we study a few one-dimensional models, for which we can verify our results by comparing them to known exact solutions in certain limits.

First we consider the $S = 1/2$ XXZ chain in the high field limit. Here, as discussed above, all the interactions including the isotropic part are included in the perturbation:

$$\mathcal{H}' = J\sum_j \boldsymbol{S}_j \cdot \boldsymbol{S}_{j+1} - J'\sum_j S_j^z S_{j+1}^z, \tag{14}$$

where $J, J' \ll H$ and z is assumed to be identical to the direction of the applied magnetic field. For this model, in eq. (13) the terms involving dynamical susceptibility turn out to vanish, and contributions from the static expectation values give the final result:

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta\omega_{m,a}(\alpha) \;=\; & J'\tanh\left(\frac{\beta H}{2}\right) + J'^2\frac{\beta\coth(\beta H)}{1+\cosh(\beta H)} \\
& - JJ'\frac{\beta}{4}\mathrm{sech}^2\left(\frac{\beta H}{2}\right)\tanh\left(\frac{\beta H}{2}\right),
\end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

where β is the inverse temperature. Because of the U(1) rotational symmetry about the z axis, there is no polarization dependence in this model.

In the zero temperature limit $\beta \to \infty$, eq. (15) reduces to J'. In this limit, the ESR probes an excitation generated out of the ground state. Since we consider the strong field case $H \gg J, J'$, the ground state is simply the fully polarized state and the elementary excitation is given by a magnon corresponding to single spin flip. Thus, in the zero temperature limit, the ESR spectrum consists of a

single delta function at $\omega = H + J'$, corresponding to the magnon energy at the zero wave vector. Namely, the shift is J', exactly as obtained in our approach.

In the infinite temperature limit $\beta \to 0$, eq. (15) reduces to ${J'}^2/(2H)$. We emphasize that the ESR lineshape in the infinite temperature limit $\beta \to 0$ is a nontrivial problem, although all the static correlation functions become trivial. In fact, to our knowledge, no exact result is available for the general J/J'. Nevertheless, for the special case of $J = J'$, the model reduces to the XX model, in which the infinite temperature limit of the lineshape is known exactly [19, 20]. (See also ref. [6] for comparison to the Kubo-Tomita theory and to a numerical calculation.) We confirmed that the shift obtained from this exact lineshape agrees with our result above. Thus, our result (15) is verified at both the zero and infinite temperature limits. We believe that eq. (15) is exact as the second order perturbation expansion at any temperature.

Next we turn to the transverse Ising model in the high field limit. We regard the Ising interaction

$$\mathcal{H}' = J' \sum_j S^x_j S^x_{j+1} \tag{16}$$

as the perturbation of the Zeeman term. Note that the quantization axis of the Ising interaction is the x-axis and thus the model is the transverse Ising model. This model lacks U(1) rotational symmetry about the z-axis. Thus it is possible to have a polarization dependence, which we have indeed obtained. Technically, the evaluation of eq. (13) for this model is more involved than in the XXZ model discussed above, as several dynamical correlation functions such as $\chi''_{\mathcal{A}\mathcal{A}}$ give non-vanishing contributions to the shift. In particular, we find nonvanishing contributions from the terms

$$\epsilon \left(\chi''_{\mathcal{A}\mathcal{A}} + \chi''_{\mathcal{A}^\dagger\mathcal{A}^\dagger} \right) - \epsilon^2 \left(\partial_\omega \chi'_{\mathcal{A}\mathcal{A}} + \partial_\omega \chi'_{\mathcal{A}^\dagger\mathcal{A}^\dagger} \right) \tag{17}$$

in the $\epsilon \to 0$ limit, due to the singularity in the dynamical correlations. Collecting all of the contributions, eq. (13) for the transverse Ising model reads

$$\delta\omega_{m,x} = \frac{J'}{2} \tanh\left(\frac{\beta H}{2}\right) + \frac{J'^2}{16H}\left[-1 + \tanh^2\left(\frac{\beta H}{2}\right) + \frac{4\beta H}{e^{\beta H} - e^{-\beta H}}\right], \tag{18}$$

$$\delta\omega_{m,y} = \frac{J'}{2} \tanh\left(\frac{\beta H}{2}\right) + \frac{J'^2}{16H}\left[3 - 3\tanh^2\left(\frac{\beta H}{2}\right) + \frac{4\beta H}{e^{\beta H} - e^{-\beta H}}\right], \tag{19}$$

for the linear polarization parallel to the x and y axes, respectively. The nontrivial polarization dependence is evident in the result.

In the infinite temperature limit $\beta \to 0$, they are further simplified as $\delta\omega_{m,x} \to {J'}^2/(16H)$ and $\delta\omega_{m,y} \to 5{J'}^2/(16H)$. Namely, there is a difference of factor 5 between the different polarizations. They, including the polarization dependence, are again found to agree with the known exact result [21] on the transverse Ising model in the infinite temperature limit. In this case, the polarization dependence, which is necessary for the agreement with the exact result, comes entirely from the nontrivial contribution (17).

On the other hand, our exact second-order results are obtained for the entire temperature range. In contrast, the Kubo-Tomita theory and its modification [7] assumes a high temperature, and the previous approach [14, 15, 16] based on the projected moment fails to give the polarization dependence.

Summary — To summarize, we have developed a direct perturbation theory on the shift of the main paramagnetic resonance in ESR, and have obtained a general and explicit formula up to the second order. As a demonstration, it is applied to the $S = 1/2$ XXZ chain and the transverse Ising chain in the strong field regime, and the shift in the second order is obtained in closed forms for the entire temperature range. The agreement with the exact results available in a few limiting cases is verified.

Our method is also applicable to systems with higher spins and in higher dimensions. The evaluation of the formulae in these cases is possible, at least in the high-field limit. Furthermore, even for strongly interacting systems, we could utilize various methods such as field theory and exact solutions to evaluate eq. (13).

We also expect that the present approach can be extended to the problem of the ESR width, as well as other problems of interest in quantum dynamics. More details and further generalization will be given in a separate publication [17].

It is a pleasure to thank K. Asano, S. Miyashita, Y. Saiga and T. Sasamoto for stimulating discussions. We are also grateful to I. Affleck for sending us a copy of ref. [14]. This work was partially supported by a Grant-in-Aid for scientific research and a 21st Century COE Program at Tokyo Tech "Nanometer-Scale Quantum Physics", both from the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology of Japan.

[1] R. Kubo and K. Tomita: J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **9** (1954) 888.
[2] M. Oshikawa and I. Affleck: Phys. Rev. Lett. **82** (1999) 5136.
[3] M. Oshikawa and I. Affleck: Phys. Rev. B **65** (2002) 134410.
[4] S. Miyashita, T. Yoshino and A. Ogasahara: J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **68** (1999) 655.

[5] T. Iitaka and T. Ebisuzaki: Phys. Rev. Lett. **90** (2003) 047203.
[6] Y. Maeda and M. Oshikawa: Phys. Rev. B **67** (2003) 224424.
[7] Y. Natsume, F. Sasagawa, M. Toyoda and I. Yamada: J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **48** (1980) 50.
[8] J. Choukroun, J.-L. Richard, and A. Stepanov: Phys. Rev. Lett. **87** (2001) 127207.
[9] H. Mori and K. Kawasaki: Prog. Theor. Phys. **28** (1962) 971.
[10] J. H. Van Vleck: Phys. Rev. **74** (1948) 1168.
[11] M. H. L. Pryce and K. W. H. Stevens: Proc. Phys. Soc. London Sect. A **63** (1950) 36.
[12] T. Usui and K. Kambe: Prog. Theor. Phys. **8** (1952) 302.
[13] J. Kanamori and M. Tachiki: J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **17** (1962) 1384.
[14] M. McMillan: M. Sc. Thesis (unpublished), University of British Columbia (1959).
[15] M. McMillan and W. Opechowski: Can. J. Phys. **38** (1960) 1168.
[16] M. McMillan and W. Opechowski: Can. J. Phys. **39** (1961) 1369.
[17] Y. Maeda and M. Oshikawa: work in progress.
[18] K. Nagata and Y. Tazuke: J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **32** (1972) 337.
[19] U. Brandt and K. Jacoby: Z. Phys. B **25** (1976) 181.
[20] U. Brandt and K. Jacoby: Z. Phys. B **26** (1977) 245.
[21] W. H. Capel and J. H. H. Perk: Physica A **87** (1977) 211.